

REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled 1-32, inclusive. New claims 33-50, inclusive, have been added to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

**I. Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance**

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

**II. Objection of Claim 15 and Rejection of Claims 13 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Applicant has canceled claims so objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is moot.

**III. Rejection of Claims 13, 14, 22, 23, and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Nielsen in view of Nielsen**

Claims 13, 14, 22, 23, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen U.S. Patent 5,907,680 in view of Nielsen U.S. Patent 6,510,461. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

*There are no spell, grammar, or punctuation checkers in prior art that include providing a user the ability to hyperlink a detected spell, grammar, or punctuation error such that the hyperlink includes the error.* All art found teaches correction of a spelling error, whereas Applicant is teaching a new result by intentionally not correcting the spelling error but instead providing a user with the ability to generate a hyperlink having the spelling error. Though, Examiner references '680 col. 6 lines 14-20 and col. 6 lines 15-27 in Paper #5 page 4, such reference teaches providing hyperlinks with corrected spelling and does not teach a need or use to provide hyperlinks that include the spelling error.

The only similarity between Nielsen and Applicant is that both teach how spell check services can be used based on some kind of condition. This is where the similarity ends. As will be shown, *Applicant teaches how spell check services can be improved to solve an entirely different problem in an existing environment whereas Nielsen teaches how conventional spell checking services can be further applied to work in a different environment.*

For instance, the third recited step of Claim 33, "providing a user with an ability to generate a hyperlink including said word upon or after determining that said word including said error is neither

said URL nor said FQDN wherein said hyperlink includes a label and a hyperlink reference, said hyperlink reference capable of accessing a network resource", shows how a user can generate a hyperlink including a detected spelling error for accessing a network resource. Such step is not taught by either Nielsen patent.

Though Nielsen '680 discloses three components (client-side, server-side and collaborative) representing three unique but complementary methods of providing spelling check services to the user, each level is invoked (see Abstract) when a connection to the specified network address is unable to be established. *Applicant does not in any way rely on first performing an unsuccessful resource location request before the step of detecting or processing a spelling error.*

All claims have been rewritten to define patentably over Nielsen and other references, alone or in combination.

#### IV. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892


Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

#### V. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 33-50, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 33-50, inclusive.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



June 24, 2004

Eric Schneider

*pro se* Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258

University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone